B.

R.F. 227-92.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1891-92.
~~191~~.
(L.R.)

File No. 68.

Serial Nos. 1—10.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—10

30

M ~~Part~~ B for Dec, 1892

SUBJECT.

Claim of Shama Rao and others to a portion in the Kayemgutta Village of Heggana halli, Maga di Taluk.

Judged
Dr

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

11A

Memo.

Inam Superintendent's letter No. 40 dated 5th November 1891.

The facts of the case are as follow:—

1 One Ananthachar, Kayum-guttedar of the Hegganahalli village, Magady Taluk, died in Krodhi, (1844-45) leaving behind him 3 Sons and a daughter (Tulsi Boyee). After the death of his 3 Sons, their widows, Kolama, Nagu Boyee and Venkoo Boyee, divided the village amongst themselves, and each widow was enjoying 1/3 Share of the village independent of the other two.

2. Kolama gave her Share

Inam Deed 1880. Sales in 1881 claimed in 1892 in 1892 !!
22/8/92

Chief Secy

~~The registry~~

The names of Jayamma & Shamamma may be registered.— Issue orders accordingly.

2— Are all changes in Inams subsequent to the Inam settl., by transfers &c, now registered by the Inam Supdt.? Are there any orders on the subject? Let me see.

If not, we have to issue a set of Instructions in regard to the registry of such changes.

22/8/92

submitted separate file

Nev Hr
1 Draft order
2 Take extract of remarks in para 2 & submit it separately

23/8 draft sub 29/8

share in gift to Bheema Char (husband of Tulsi Boyee), Nagu Boyee made over her share to Bawaji Shama Row and his brother Jaya Row, for Rs 347. 14. 1, and Venkoo Boyee was enjoying the share herself. So, there were actually three share holders in the village, viz, Bheema Char, who had his share by gift, Bawaji ShamaRao and Jaya Row who purchased their share from Nagu Boyee, and Venkoo Boyee who obtained her share by inheritance.

3. On the death of Nagu Boyee, Venkoo Boyee, objected to the assignment of the share to Bawaji Shama Row and Jayarow, and filed a suit in the

Civil

Civil Court to recover the Share assigned to them. But in the Court it was finally decided that Venkoo Boyee was not entitled to the Share of Nagu Boyee, because before her death she had been enjoying her Share independent of the other two widows; and the suit was dismissed with costs. Thus Banaji Shamarow and Jaya Rao established their claims to a third Share in the village and they were enjoying their Share.

4. During the Inam Settlement in 1880, Bheema Char, one of the Share holders, failed to bring to the notice of the Inam Superintendent, the names of Banaji Shamarao and Jayarao, his

his co-shareholders, to be inserted in the Inam Register and also in the Title Deed. At the time of Inam Settle-ment, the latter were not present to establish their claims.

5. The petitioners Bangi Shamarao and Jayarao complained in their petitions dated respectively 22nd July 1881 and 30th January 1891, that their co-share-holders (Bheemabhai and Venkoo Boyee) pur-posely did not bring to the notice of the Inam Superintendent their names to be registered as Kayamguttadars and that no notice was given to them of the arrival of the Inam Superintendent for settlement and re-quested that their names might be inserted in the Inam Register.

The

the correspondence shews that no such notice was given to them according to the rules.

6. The petitioners have produced the following documents in support of their claims :—

(a) The deed of sale executed by the legal shareholder Nagu Boyee.

(b). Receipts granted by the Amildar of the Magdi Taluk for the Gutha amount paid by Banagi Shamarow.

and (c) Copies of judgment and Decree passed in their favor.

---

7. Submitted for orders with Extract of Inam Rules on the Subject.

Serial Nos 1 to 2 of file.

dt 6.V.

Recd. from the Mutsa N.V. - rac' dept & submitted.

8 This is a reference from

the Inam Supdt. (see his
letter No 23 d/ 16th. Aug/91)
enquiring whether the
~~absolute~~ names of
Banaji Shamarao and
Jaya Rao can be entered
in the Inam Register and
Title Deed as owners of
a third share in the village -
The Title Deed issued in
Dec/1880 recognises Venkobaji
as being entitled to 2/3rds,
and Bhimachar to 1/3rd
share in the village -

Memo for orders

Sub Mark 2/2/92

9. The Dy Comm. may
be requested to send for
Venkubaji and Bhima
Char and ascertain what
they have to say in regard
to the proposed registration
of a third share of the village in
the names of Banaji
Shama Rao and Jaya Rao.

10. Yes. Draft for
Approval
Pconnellon
3/2 2/2/92

11 Drafted and issued - Vide
Rr. 4/2 No 1259 2
358 dt 5/2/92

Serial No 6.

12. In his letter No. 299 dt 22/1/92
the Dy. Comm. of Bangalore

7

submitted memo with enclosures from the Revl. Asstt Commr. No 268 from which it would appear that Vaikoba is dead and Bheemachari objects to a third share being given to Shama Rao and Jaya Rao on the ground that they are enjoying only ¼ share since 1861. He further promised to make a further report regarding Bheemachari's allegations.

7687-C

Serial No 9.

13. Pursuant to the above promise the Dy Commr of Bangalore, in his No. 138 of 9th June 1892, submits the Report*. From the Report* & its enclosures it would appear that Bheemachari admitted in his deposition† in Civil Suit No 395 of 1889 on the file of the Bangalore Munsiff that Shama Rao enjoyed a third share in the Village though he now states that the actual enjoyment of Shama Rao and Jaya Rao has been only ¼ share. Bheemachar failed to produce any document in

* No 423 Enclosure
• Enclosures of file to No 138 Part-I.

†. Last (but) few pages in the enclosed file. Part-II
(Encl. to Inam Supdt No 23 of 10/8/91 & 40 of 5/11/91)

support of his latter statement.
M. Vaidianatha Iyer who enquired
into the case is therefore of
opinion that Bheemachari's
objection is untenable and
that 1/3 share may be
registered in the name of
Jaya Rao and Shamiekao

14. Submitted ~~[illegible]~~
for orders.

M. Dy
19/8/92 Subd

15 The registration of the
names of Shamakao &
Jayakow as holders of 1/3rd
share in the village being
disputed by Bheemachari,
the former may be referred
to the Civil Courts for the
establishment of their
claim - Mysr 20/8/92
To Commdr (Rev) 20/8/92
Attd 20/8

16. Draft- submitted as per

orders on page 1 of this Note.

29/10/92

Legal No 10. 17. Draft issued - No. 3500-76 dated 1/11/92

11 18. In letter No. 349 11/10/92 the Imam Supdt explains the delay in submitting the reference & this Office for orders.

19. Draft reminder to the letter is put up.

Draft issued. Vide Pro: No 7740 R7-76-92 2nd December/92 BB

20 With reference to the ~~Dot~~ Councillor's & the Chief ~~Secretary~~ Secy's order para 20 on page 1 of this Note, attention is respectfully invited ~~is solicited~~ to Legal Nos 1 & 2 of this file on the subject of Rules. It will be seen from Para 26 of the Imam Precis and para 12 of Imam Rules that all changes should be reported to Govt. before the same are Registered by the Imam Supdt. Submitted the orders upon Precis which Imam No 26 is based.

BB 17/10 drafted Pursuit

Draft dated 6/11/92 BB

Extract from Land Inam Rules.

\+ \+ \+ \+ \+ \+

XII. The settlement will be made either with the registered holders of the inam, or, where none are registered, with the head member of the family enjoying the inam, who according to existing practice, is alone considered responsible to Government. But this rule will not interfere with the enjoyment of Subordinate Shares in the inams by the other members of the family, which will also be recorded on the register.

Inam Settlement to be made with the registered holders or with the head member of the family enjoying it.

XIII. When the inam has to all intents and purposes been entirely abandoned, there being no acknowledged owner in

Abandonment and non-appearance of inamdars how to be dealt with.

in existance, or, if being in existance, he omits to come forward, to claim it, and when the recorded possessor fails after due notice to appear to prove his title, such inam will, in the first instance be placed under attachment by the Assist= =ant Superintendent attached to the Inam Settlement, and after the expiration of one year from the date of the notice will be held to be liable to be fully assessed to the public revenues.

× × × × ×

Course of procedure to be observed by the Assistants in recording claims and in investigating titles to Inams in the several Districts of the Territories of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

× × × × × ×

8. Previously to the arrival of the Assistant at the taluk Kasba, a general invitation will have been issued, through the Deputy Superintendent of the District, calling upon all the inamdars to be in attendance at the expected time, with their Sannads and title-deeds, and with a written Statement giving their name, age, place of residence, relationship

Commissioner.

relationship to original holder, the particulars of their family or heirs, and the manner and date of their acquiring the inam; and the Amildar will be instructed by the Superintendent of the Division to secure their attendance in the same manner as that of ryots for the jamabandi Settlement.

Commissioner

+ + + × × ×

10. The Assistant will prepare his Registers from the Shanbhog's Statements and the Kuzur records, checking and verifying the one by the other and ascertaining by a verbal inquiry all points which are not to be found in the records — such as the relationship to predecessors.

predecessors, existing family, and actual title of the present incumbent. He will also examine and satisfy himself of the authenticity of the Sanad, and other title-deeds which may be produced, and which in cases of doubt will be forwarded to the Inam Commissioner with the reports of the cases. In the column of the register set apart for remarks, he will enter succinctly the nature of, and circumstances relating to, the inam and its present claimant, with the purport of any orders which may have been passed regarding it, and he will give his own recommendation

Superintendent.

recommendation ~
clearly and briefly.

× × × × ×

12. Should any of the
inamdars neglect to
appear either in person
or by an authorized
agent in compliance
with the invitation
issued under Rule 13,
a list of such absentees
shall be furnished by
the Shanbhogs to the
Assistant immediately
upon his arrival in the
taluk, who will thereupon
issue individual notices
through the Amildar to
the absentees, calling ~
upon them to appear in
person, or by an ~
authorized agent, ~
with the required ~
information within
a period of 15 days,
under the penalty ~
provided

provided by Rule 13, viz/
the attachment by the
Assistant Superinten=
=dent of their inam
lands for default, and
the full assessment of
the inam after the
expiration of one year
if the default continue.
The notice shall be
served upon the inamdar
or, if his place of
residence be not known,
upon his representative
or the person in possession
of the inam, or it shall
be posted in the village
Choultry, or in any
other public building,
or place in the village
in which the inam is
situated.

× × × × ×

14. After the Assistant's
departure from the
District, should the
inamdar

inamdar or the party
claiming the inam
appear before the Inam
Commissioner within
the period of one year
from the date of the
notice, arrangements
will be made by him
for its Settlement, and
failing the appearance
of the claimant within
that period, it will
be subjected to full
assessment.

× × × × × × × -

6.7

Superintendent

Extract from Inam
Rules

V

2

Extract from the Inam Precis

No. 13. Issue of one Title-deed

Only one title-deed to be issued for any one inam held under one grant, whether it consists of one or more than number and whether the land be situated in one or more villages, without reference to the number of shares. Only such shares are to be entered on the back of the title-deed as are recorded at the time of registry. All disputed claims to be referred to the Civil Courts

Inam Commissioner's Letter No. 804 of the 31st May 1873.

Inam Commissioner's No. 1472, dated 23rd September 1873.

No. 26. Alteration of Title-Deeds or Final orders in any case.

It is not competent to the Inam Superintendent, or the Inam Commissioner, to make any changes in a title-deed, or a final order. The Chief Commissioner can alone sanction this. When alteration or

Inam Commissioner's No. 1870, dated 14th November 1873.

or modification ~
appears necessary for
any title-deed, or
bind order, a full
report will be made
to the Inam Commissioner
for submission to ~
Chief Commissioner
for consideration &
orders.

No 33. Grantwar ~
Registration of
Inams; see also
No 13.
Inam Commissioner's
No 494, dated 24th
March 1874.

1. Only one Title-
Deed shall be issued
for one inam held ~
under one grant ~
whether it consists
of one or more numbers
and whether the lands
be situated in one or
more villages. Only
such shares ~ shall
be noted (as at present
on the reverse of the
Title-Deed for each
inam, as are actually
in enjoyment without
dispute at the time
of the registry; all
disputed

disputed claims being
referred for decision
to the regular Courts.
2. Save portions of
an issamvar grant,
confirmed by Sunnuj
in the jari inamati ~
accounts, may occasionally
be found to be covered
by sanads given ~
previous to the date
of the above settle-
-ment, and be included
therein notwithstanding
the production of such
sanads now, each ~
entry in the jari ~
accounts will generally
be taken as the basis
of the grant, for which
are Sikka-deed will
be issued.
3. No alteration ~
whatever shall be ~
made in the present
system of casawar
and villagewar re-
-gistry; but, in column
19 of each case, a note
will

will be concisely made to show whether it be a whole grant, complete in itself, or whether only a portion of a larger grant. In the latter case, a reference will be made to the register sheet in which the asali or Kasaba village named in the jari account is recorded, and in this principal entry all the details of the isamwar grant will be given, with clear and appropriate references, to the dakhali cases forming portions thereof. The number of which must be plainly visible.

4. For the convenience of Manzewar collection, the particulars of each inam in each village, being portions of such isamwar grant, shall be shown in the asali case of the principal village register sheet,

as

V

as well as the proportion
of quit-rent due therean
5. Where however a
portion of a grant, ~
situated wholly in
one village, be in
the enjoyment of an
alienee, and such
alienation be proved
valid under Rule
IX, a separate Title-
Deed will be issued
therefor, to such alienee
but in no other case,
the remainder (after
deducting such portion)
being confirmed to
the heirs of the original
grantee under one ~
Title-Deed, on which
will be noted the ~
number of the Title-
-Deed granted for
the alienated portion
thereof, with particulars
of such alienation. A
similar reference will
also be made on the ~
Title-Deed of the alienee

Copy Ab E.V.

1/31



1891 - 92

(3)

From

The Secretary of State for India

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 10th August

Rec'd 11th "

Enclosure No. Vernacular
" Engl. Papers

No. 23 of 1891-92

Solicits the instructions of Government as to whether under the circumstances represented in the accompanying Memo, the necessary alterations can be made both in the Index Register and Title-Deed.

C. Rabindranath
CS
10/8/91

Read
12-8-91.

A2
12-8-91

No 23 Inám Supt's Office,
Bangalore d/ 10th August 1891.

To,

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of Mysore.

Sir,

In submitting a memo (No 5 dated the 5th Instant) together with all the papers connected therewith, as per the accompanying Jerist Patty, I have the honor, with reference to Inám Precis No 26, to solicit the instructions of Government as to whether, under the circumstances, the necessary alterations can be made both in the Inám Register and Title-Deed.

2. It is requested that the enclosures may kindly be returned when no longer required.—

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.

N.K.

Supt of Inám Setts.

3 1/1

No 5.

Memo.

1. Vide the correspondence ending with Bangalore Amildar's report No 336/135 dated 27th June 1891.

2. One Banaji Sham Rao, complains that his right to 1/3 share in Kayamgutta Heggenahally village, Javarekere hobli, Magdi Taluk, was not brought to notice by Bhimachar, who appeared for settlement before the Inam Superintendent, and, consequently his name was not registered, at the time, and requests the entry of his and his brother Jaya Rao's name both in the Register and Title-Deed — He produced the following documents in support of his claim and Enjoyment:—

18. Receipts granted by the Amildar of Magdi Taluk, for the punctual payment of the gutta, amount and Local, cesses from the year Srimukha (1873-74) to Virodhi (1889-90)

2. Copies of Judgment and Decree, passed in his favor, in O.S. No 395 of 1889 on the file of the Munsiffs' Court of Bangalore.

1 Copy of deposition, given by the said Bhimachar in the above suit.

3 It is clear from the documents quoted above

that

that the complainant and his brother pur-
-chased the 1/3rd share from one Nagubai,
the daughter-in-law, of the original grantee,
on the 16th January 1861 for Rs: 347-14-1
and have been enjoying it since that
time, paying the proportionate gutta
direct
Amount to Government.

Bangalore,
the 5th August 1891

Supt. of Inam Settls.

N.K

9
9.31

(General Serial No. 30).

189/.

From

To The Superintendent of Inam settlements

Dated 16th September

Despatched 18

Received

Enclosures No. one

General No. 6947

In No. 217

His No. 23 of the 10th ultimo forwarding the papers relative to the complaint of one Bapaji Bhana Rao, one of the share-holders of the Kayam-gutta village of Hegga-dahalli in the Savare-kere Hobli of the Na-gadi Taluk and soli-citing instructions as to whether the necessary alterations may be made in the ~~Inam~~ Title Deed and the Inam Register con-nected with the case.

With reference to the

(1) Bhanaji Shama Rao's petition dated 22nd July/81 addressed to the Inam Supdt. on the subject (vide Shama Rao's petition No. 528 dated 30-1-91).

(2) Inam Register shewing the details of the settlement of the case Gl. No. 372 / I.D.No. 27 of the Hayamgutta village of Heggenahalli, Nagadi S-alnk.

(3) The deed of Sale of 1861 executed by Nagu Boyee in favor of Bhanaji Shama Rao and his brother, shewing that 1/3 share of the village has been sold by her to them.

the above has the honour to request that the marginal noted records may be forwarded to this office.

2. The petition No. 528 dated 30th Jany/91 from the said Shama Rao is forwarded herewith for reference and obliging return.

By order,

Sd/-

S.S.

Under Secy.

1/9.31

1891. 7500

In 337.

From

The Supt^H of Inám Settls:

To, The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 5th
Desp^d 10^c } November

Enclosure no (3. 1 Inam Rs 2 Fidelity Cert 3 file V Cooke

No 40 of 1891-92

His Docket No 6947/M.217 of the 16th September last.

In returning the Enclosure of the above, has the honor to forward herewith the marginally noted records, as called for, and to request that the same may be kindly returned when no longer required.

S. Venkataramana Rao

Supt^H of Inám Settls:

C V Venkatacharya
as
4/4/91

Read
12.11.91

12/11/91

× 1. Banaji Sham Row's petition dated 22^d July 1881 and its correspondence (file).
1. Inám Register (Sheet No 350) of Heggandahalli K. G. Village
1. The deed of sale of 1861 executed by Nagubai.

9
9 31

(General Serial No. 30).

1892.

From

To The Deputy Commr
Bangalore Dist.

Dated 22 February 92

Despatched 29

Received

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 12592
No. 350

With Copy & Translation of Supt's letter No. 23 dated 16th August 91, which explains: & is hereunto forwarded for reference.

The Deputy Commr
Bangalore District,
is requested to send
for Ven Kubayi and
Puttaiah Chandrashekar
holders in the
Kuguru gutta village
of Heggarahalli,
Magadi Taluk,
and ascertain
whether they have any objection
~~to what they have to~~
~~say in regard to~~

the proposed Rejection

tion of a 3rd share

of the village in the

names of Benaji Shama

Row and Jaya Row

who, it is alleged, purchased that

share for Rs 347-14-1

from Nagubayi, one

of the daughters-in-law

of the late Ananthu

Chan of the said

original grantee, the

Kayemputta village

By Order

Draft. 5/12

Chief Secy.

BM

5/12/92.

Petition in enjoyment of that share,
praying the pattahs and
amount directed to be issued from 16th Jany 1864,
the date on which they
Registrar,
1st Canarese
Assistant

Rev Br.
Mem 28/6

Recd
28/6/92

(General Serial No. 30.) 3547

189 . 1892 (7)

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 22d
Despatched 23d } June 1892
Received

Enclosures No. 3.

General No.
D No. 299.

His docket No 125/92 / 358 dated 5th February last, ordering to ascertain from Venkuboji and Bheemachar, shareholders in the Kayemgutta village of Heggamahalli, Magadi Taluk, whether they have any objection to the proposed registration of a 3rd share of the village in the name of Ramaji Shama Rao and Jaya Rao.

With reference to the above has the honor to forward

A
28-6-92

herewith, copy of Memo
No 268 dated 17th Instant
from Mr Vydianatha Iyer
General Assistant Commissioner,
together with its enclosures,
from which it will be
seen that Venkuboyi is
dead and Bheemachari
objects to a 3d share being
registered in the name
of Jaya Rao and Shama
Rao, on the ground mentioned
in his statement. Mr
Veidyanatha Iyer has not
ascertained the truth of
the allegations, which will
be reported later on.

H Haig Mason

p. Dy Commissioner

Thus

(7)

No: 268
Enclosure

Memo

Deputy Commissioner's docket No: 1995 dated 12th: February last, forwarding for compliance Chief Secretary's docket No. 1259½/358 dated 5th: Idem and requesting to ascertain from Venkabayee and Bhima Char, whether they have any objection to registering a 3d share of Heggambally village, Nagudy Taluk, in the names of Banojee Rama Rao and Jaya Rao.

Venkabayee mentioned in the above is reported to be dead. The written statement with an enclosure presented by Bhima Char is herewith forwarded. It will be seen from them, that the minister

upon his own name being
registered and denies that
Rhama Rao and Jeya Rao enjoy
a 3d. of every property. The
enclosed is a list of the extent
of property which he admits
to be in the actual enjoyment
of Rhama Rao and Jeya Rao.
Chief Secretary's Orders and
its Enclosures are herewith
returned.

Bangalore
17th June/92

(Signed) S. Vidyanatha Iyer
Genl. Asstt. Commissioner

"Copy"

Waring Mason.

Jr. Dy. Commissioner

mms

[illegible]

श्रीमाचार रुजु

[illegible]

Forwarded Cavan No 138 of 9 5.92

To

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Bangalore District.

Dated 10th/12 July 1892

No. 443
R. 76-92

His No. 299 of the 22nd June last
on the subject of the registration
in the names of Bamaji Shama
Row and Jaya Row of a third
Share in the Kaveriguttu
Village of Heggandahalli in the
Magadi Taluk.

The further report promised
in the above is awaited.

Dresden,

10/7/92
Under Secty.

DD

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr of the Bangalore District

Dated 10th July/92

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 443

No. R. 72-92

Diary fo. a'h C

Awaiting a further report on the subject of the registration in the names of Bavaji Rao Shamarao & Jayarao of a third share in the Kayemgetta village of Heggonahalli in the Magadi Taluk —

Rev. Ref. Mrs
19/8

(General Serial No. 30.) OFFICE OF THE
1573.
1892. 963
419

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 9th August 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 a file

General No.

No 138.

His docket No. 443 dated 12
Ultimo, calling for the further
report promised in this Office
No. 229 of 22nd June last, on
the subject of the registra
in the name of Banaji Sh.
-ma Rao and Jaya Rao
of a 3rd share in the Kay-
-engutta village of Heggana
-halli village, Magady Taluk

— " —

With reference to the
above, has the honor to for-
-ward herewith docket
No. 429 dated 18th Ultimo,
together with its enclosures
from the General Assistant
Commissioner Mr. Vaithyanath
Iyer, from which it will

Recd. 11/8

be seen that Bhimachari admitted in his deposition in Civil Suit No. 395 of 1889, on the file of the Bangalore Munsiff's Court, that Shamarao enjoyed a 3rd share in the village.

A Bapu
Dy Commissioner.

1892.

From The Genl. Asst Commr.
Bangalore Dist.

To The Dy. Commr.
Bangalore Dist.

Dated 18th July 1892.

No. 429

His docket no 646 of 22/6 last

requesting to enquire and ascertain the truth of the allegations made by Bheemachar regarding the enjoyment of Shamachar and Jayachar in the Village of Heggunahally, Magadi Taluk.

In reply has the honor to forward herewith depositions of Bheemachar and Shamachar together with Patties given by them. Shamachar claims 1/2 share in the Village while Bheemachar states that the actual enjoyment of Shamachar and Jayachar has been only 1/4 share ever since the

year 1861, but Ravat besides failing
to produce any document to support
his statement he himself has acknowledged
in his deposition in Civil Suit
No. 395 of 1889 on the file of Munsiff
of Bangalore that the enjoyment
of Ramachar is 1/3 share. Hence
the objection of Sheenachar
seems untenable and therefore
1/3 share in the Village may be
registered in the name of Jayarao
and Ramachar

Sd/- Venkatanarasimha Iyer
2nd Asst. Comm.
Bangalore

Copied from original in
file received from Dy. Comm.
Bangalore with No. 1389 of Records 92

Read,

Letters dated the 10th August and 5th November 1891, Nos 23 and 40, from the Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Dockets dated 22d. June and 9th August 1892 Nos 299 and 138, from the Deputy Commr. Bangalore D.

N. 3500-1. R.F. 76-92 dt. 1/8/92 3.

With their original enclosures.

Order thereon:-

With the first of the papers read above, the Inam Superintendent submits a Memo and original papers relating to the Kayemgutta Village of Heggunahully in the Magadi Taluk, and solicits instructions ~~of Government~~ as to whether the names of Shama Rao

and Jaya Rao, purchasers of one third share in the said village, ~~can~~ may be inserted in the Inam Register and Title Deed.

2. The Dy Commr of Bangalore submits, with reference to a call made by this Office, a report of inquiry held by Mr Vaidyanatha Iyer 2nd General Assistant Comr into the claim of Shama Rao and Jaya Rao referred to above and states that Bheemachar, another shareholder in the Village objects to the proposed alter-ations in the documents, which objection, he states, is untenable.

3. From the papers submitted it is clear that Shama Rao and his brother Jaya Rao are

the purchasers of 1/3rd share in the Village belonging to one of the daughters-in-law of the original grantee, and as such have been enjoying it since 1861, paying the proportionate quitta amount direct to Government. It is also clear that their claim was not brought to notice when the settlement was made by the Inam Department in 1880.

4. Under such circumstances ~~that~~ the Govt. are pleased to sanction, under para 12 of the Inam Rules, the insertion in the Inam Register and Title Deed, of the names of Shama Rao and Jaya Rao as the owners of one third

Share in the said Kayem.

Gutta Village -

5. ✓

Letter

Dept

Chief Secretary

WM

It is observed that the claim now disposed of was also heard & the Inam Sub-Dept as far back as in 1881 - & it is not clear why it took ten years to submit it for the final orders of Govt -

To

The Secretary - Inam Settlements

in duplicate with original papers

The Dy Commr Bangalore Dist

with original enclosures.

8782

1892

R992

From

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements in Mysore.

(1)

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government of Mysore.

Dated 11th
Despatched 12" } October
Received.

Enclosure No. (Ver: corrce)

No. 34 of 1892-93

With reference to Govt. Proceedings No 3500-1 / R.776-92 dated the 1st ultimo, states that there has been no delay on the part of the Inam Office in submitting a report (Government) for the reasons assigned within.

Rev: March
12/10/92

Submitted for information
The letter may be recorded & the Enclosure returned

H. D.
14/10

Read 13/10

(11

No 34 Inam Supt^ts Office.
Bangalore 9/11th October 1892.

To,
The Chief Secretary to the Government
of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to para 5 of Govern-ment Proceedings No 3500-1 R.T.76-92 dated the 1st instant, I have the honor to invite the Chief Secretary's attention to the Vernacular Pro-ceedings returned with the above, from which it will be observed that, although the claim was preferred to this Office in 1881, the party did not appear before the Amildar for enquiry-(vide Amil's report No 330/751, dated 13th February 1882)

2. After obtaining a decree in the civil Court for his share in the village, the party again presented a petition in 1891 for necessary alterations in the Title-Deed and Quit-Rent Registers, and the matter was duly brought to the notice of Government by this Office Letter No 23 dated 10th August 1891.

All enclosures to be transmitted to be thereby returned

From

3. From the foregoing reasons, it will be seen that there has been no unreasonable delay on the part of this Office in submitting a report to Government on the subject.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant

J. D. Smart
Supt. of Train. Sails.

D.

Read,

Letter No. 34 dated the 11th October 1892. from the Superintendent of Maun Settlements in Mysore stating that there has been no delay on the part of his Office in submitting the report to Government in re Kayenguttu Village of Heggenahally, Magadi Hobli as the party did not appear before the Amildar till 1891

7740
No. R.F.76-92 W7

Order thereon.

2/5 — 12-92

Recorded.

Chf Secy.

To the Supt. Maun Settlements with original records.